- 2. In response to paragraph 2 of the SAC, Defendant admits that Defendant DIGITAL POINT SOLUTIONS, INC. was incorporated as a California corporation on May 14, 2007, but denies all remaining allegations contained therein.
- 3. In response to paragraph 3 of the SAC, Defendant admits that at all relevant times, Defendant was an individual residing and doing business in the State of California. Defendant admits that Defendant DIGITAL POINT SOLUTIONS, INC. was incorporated as a California corporation on May 14, 2007 and that Defendant has been the sole owner thereof at all relevant times thereafter. Defendant denies all remaining allegations contained in paragraph 3.
- 4. In response to paragraph 4 of the SAC, this paragraph does not allege any facts and therefore does not require a response.
- 5. In response to paragraph 5 of the SAC, Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in said paragraph, and on that basis denies each and every allegation contained therein.
- 6. In response to paragraph 6 of the SAC, Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in said paragraph, and on that basis denies each and every allegation contained therein.
- 7. In response to paragraph 7 of the SAC, Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in said paragraph, and on that basis denies each and every allegation contained therein.
- 8. In response to paragraph 8 of the SAC, Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in said paragraph, and on that basis denies each and every allegation contained therein.
- 9. In response to paragraph 9 of the SAC, Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in said paragraph, and on that basis denies each and every allegation contained therein.
- 10. In response to paragraph 10 of the SAC, Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in said paragraph, and on that basis denies each and every allegation contained therein.

11

12

13 14

15

17

16

18 19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27

28

- 11. In response to paragraph 11 of the SAC, this paragraph does not allege any facts and therefore does not require a response.
- 12. In response to paragraph 12 of the SAC, Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in said paragraph, and on that basis denies each and every allegation contained therein.
- 13. In response to paragraph 13 of the SAC, this paragraph does not allege any facts and therefore does not require a response.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 14. In response to paragraph 14 of the SAC, Defendant denies each and every allegation contained therein.
- 15. In response to paragraph 15 of the SAC, Defendant denies each and every allegation contained therein.
- In response to paragraph 16 of the SAC, Defendant denies each and every allegation 16. contained therein.

INTRADISTRICT ASSIGNMENT

17. In response to paragraph 17 of the SAC, Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations that Plaintiff's headquarters are located in San Jose, Santa Clara County, California, and on that basis denies said allegations. As to the remaining allegations contained therein, Defendant asserts the privilege against self-incrimination under the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution; the Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 501; the California Constitution, Article 1, Section 15; and California Evidence Code section 940. To the extent Defendant determines that there is no longer potential for criminal prosecution, Defendant expressly reserves the right to withdraw his assertion of the privilege, to supplement and/or seek leave to amend this response accordingly (in whole or in part), and to object to the use or disclosure of the this response for any purpose whatsoever.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

18. In response to paragraph 18 of the SAC, Defendant admits that Plaintiff operates an online trading forum and that sellers may list items for sale and buyers may bid on and purchase items of

interest through Plaintiff's website. Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations regarding the present circumstances under which Plaintiff operates its affiliate marketing program, and on that basis denies each and every remaining allegation contained therein.

- 19. In response to paragraph 19 of the SAC, Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations regarding the circumstances under which Plaintiff presently operates its affiliate marketing program, and on that basis denies each and every allegation contained therein.
- 20. In response to paragraph 20 of the SAC, Defendant admits that Plaintiff has used the services of Commission Junction's in administering the affiliate marketing program. Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations contained in said paragraph, and on that basis denies each and every allegation contained therein.
- 21. In response to paragraph 21 of the SAC, Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations regarding the circumstances under which Plaintiff presently operates its affiliate marketing program, and on that basis denies each and every allegation contained therein.
- 22. In response to paragraph 22 of the SAC, Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations regarding the circumstances under which Plaintiff presently operates its affiliate marketing program, and on that basis denies each and every allegation contained therein.
- 23. In response to paragraph 23 of the SAC, Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations regarding the circumstances under which Plaintiff presently operates its affiliate marketing program, and on that basis denies each and every allegation contained therein.
- 24. In response to paragraph 24 of the SAC, the alleged definition of "cookie stuffing" does not allege any facts and therefore does not require a response. Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations relating to Plaintiff's alleged analyses, and on that basis denies each such allegation. Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or

8

5

12

13

11

14

16

15

18

17

19 20

21 22

23 24

25

26

27

28

information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations relating to KFC, and on that basis denies each such allegation. As to the remaining allegations contained therein, Defendant asserts the privilege against self-incrimination under the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution; the Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 501; the California Constitution, Article 1, Section 15; and California Evidence Code section 940. To the extent Defendant determines that there is no longer potential for criminal prosecution, Defendant expressly reserves the right to withdraw his assertion of the privilege, to supplement and/or seek leave to amend this response accordingly (in whole or in part), and to object to the use or disclosure of the this response for any purpose whatsoever.

- 25. In response to paragraph 25 of the SAC, Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations relating to KFC, and on that basis denies each such allegation contained therein. As to the remaining allegations contained therein, Defendant hereby asserts the privilege against self-incrimination under the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution; the Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 501; the California Constitution, Article 1, Section 15; and California Evidence Code section 940. To the extent Defendant determines that there is no longer potential for criminal prosecution, Defendant expressly reserves the right to withdraw his assertion of the privilege, to seek leave to amend and/or supplement this response accordingly (in whole or in part), and to object to the use or disclosure of the this response for any purpose whatsoever.
- 26. In response to paragraph 26 of the SAC, Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations that the User Agreement was agreed to by Defendant, and on that basis denies each such allegation contained therein. Defendant denies the applicability of the alleged User Agreement and that any causes of action set forth in the SAC arose therefrom. Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations relating to KFC, and on that basis denies each such allegation contained therein. As to the remaining allegations contained therein, Defendant hereby asserts the privilege against self-incrimination under the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution; the Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 501; the California Constitution, Article 1, Section 15; and California Evidence Code section 940. To the extent Defendant determines that there is no longer potential for criminal prosecution, Defendant expressly reserves the right to withdraw his assertion of the privilege, to seek

leave to amend and/or supplement this response accordingly (in whole or in part), and to object to the use or disclosure of the this response for any purpose whatsoever.

- 27. In response to paragraph 27 of the SAC, Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations relating to KFC, and on that basis denies each such allegation contained therein. As to the remaining allegations contained therein, Defendant hereby asserts the privilege against self-incrimination under the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution; the Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 501; the California Constitution, Article 1, Section 15; and California Evidence Code section 940. To the extent Defendant determines that there is no longer potential for criminal prosecution, Defendant expressly reserves the right to withdraw his assertion of the privilege, to seek leave to amend and/or supplement this response accordingly (in whole or in part), and to object to the use or disclosure of the this response for any purpose whatsoever.
- 28. In response to paragraph 28 of the SAC, Defendant hereby asserts the privilege against self-incrimination under the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution; the Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 501; the California Constitution, Article 1, Section 15; and California Evidence Code section 940. To the extent Defendant determines that there is no longer potential for criminal prosecution, Defendant expressly reserves the right to withdraw his assertion of the privilege, to seek leave to amend and/or supplement this response accordingly (in whole or in part), and to object to the use or disclosure of the this response for any purpose whatsoever.
- 29. In response to paragraph 29 of the SAC, Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations relating to KFC, and on that basis denies each such allegation contained therein. As to the remaining allegations contained therein, Defendant hereby asserts the privilege against self-incrimination under the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution; the Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 501; the California Constitution, Article 1, Section 15; and California Evidence Code section 940. To the extent Defendant determines that there is no longer potential for criminal prosecution, Defendant expressly reserves the right to withdraw his assertion of the privilege, to seek leave to amend and/or supplement this response accordingly (in whole or in part), and to object to the use or disclosure of the this response for any purpose whatsoever.

- 30. In response to paragraph 30 of the SAC, Defendant hereby asserts the privilege against self-incrimination under the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution; the Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 501; the California Constitution, Article 1, Section 15; and California Evidence Code section 940. To the extent Defendant determines that there is no longer potential for criminal prosecution, Defendant expressly reserves the right to withdraw his assertion of the privilege, to seek leave to amend and/or supplement this response accordingly (in whole or in part), and to object to the use or disclosure of the this response for any purpose whatsoever.
- 31. In response to paragraph 31 of the SAC, Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in said paragraph, and on that basis denies each and every allegation contained therein.
- 32. In response to paragraph 32 of the SAC, Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations relating to KFC, and on that basis denies each such allegation contained therein. As to the remaining allegations contained therein, Defendant hereby asserts the privilege against self-incrimination under the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution; the Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 501; the California Constitution, Article 1, Section 15; and California Evidence Code section 940. To the extent Defendant determines that there is no longer potential for criminal prosecution, Defendant expressly reserves the right to withdraw his assertion of the privilege, to seek leave to amend and/or supplement this response accordingly (in whole or in part), and to object to the use or disclosure of the this response for any purpose whatsoever.
- 33. In response to paragraph 33 of the SAC, Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations relating to KFC, and on that basis denies each such allegation contained therein. Defendant denies the applicability of the alleged User Agreement and that any causes of action set forth in the SAC arose therefrom. As to the remaining allegations contained therein, Defendant hereby asserts the privilege against self-incrimination under the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution; the Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 501; the California Constitution, Article 1, Section 15; and California Evidence Code section 940. To the extent Defendant determines that there is no longer potential for criminal prosecution, Defendant expressly reserves the right to withdraw his assertion of the privilege, to seek leave to amend and/or supplement this response

accordingly (in whole or in part), and to object to the use or disclosure of the this response for any purpose whatsoever.

34. In response to paragraph 34 of the SAC, Defendant admits that Commission Junction filed an action against Defendants Kessler's Flying Circus, Brian Dunning and Todd Dunning; Commission Junction sought to recoup payments made to said defendants; and that said action has settled. Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations contained in said paragraph, and on that basis denies each and every allegation contained therein.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION (18 U.S.C. §1030)

- 35. In response to paragraph 35 of the SAC, Defendant refers to and incorporates herein Defendant's responses as provided in paragraphs 1 through 34 above.
- 36. In response to paragraph 36 of the SAC, Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations relating to KFC, and on that basis denies each such allegation contained therein. As to the remaining allegations contained therein, Defendant hereby asserts the privilege against self-incrimination under the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution; the Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 501; the California Constitution, Article 1, Section 15; and California Evidence Code section 940. To the extent Defendant determines that there is no longer potential for criminal prosecution, Defendant expressly reserves the right to withdraw his assertion of the privilege, to seek leave to amend and/or supplement this response accordingly (in whole or in part), and to object to the use or disclosure of the this response for any purpose whatsoever.
- 37. In response to paragraph 37 of the SAC, Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations regarding the similarity of the alleged User Agreements or the terms thereof, and on that basis denies each such allegation contained therein. Defendant denies the applicability of the alleged User Agreement and that any causes of action set forth in the SAC arose therefrom. Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations relating to KFC, and on that basis denies each such allegation contained therein. As to the remaining allegations contained in said paragraph, Defendant hereby asserts the

privilege against self-incrimination under the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution; the Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 501; the California Constitution, Article 1, Section 15; and California Evidence Code section 940. To the extent Defendant determines that there is no longer potential for criminal prosecution, Defendant expressly reserves the right to withdraw his assertion of the privilege, to seek leave to amend and/or supplement this response accordingly (in whole or in part), and to object to the use or disclosure of the this response for any purpose whatsoever.

- 38. In response to paragraph 38 of the SAC, Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations relating to KFC, and on that basis denies each such allegation contained therein. Defendant denies each and every remaining allegation contained therein.
- 39. In response to paragraph 39 of the SAC, Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations relating to KFC, and on that basis denies each such allegation contained therein. As to the remaining allegations contained therein, Defendant hereby asserts the privilege against self-incrimination under the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution; the Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 501; the California Constitution, Article 1, Section 15; and California Evidence Code section 940. To the extent Defendant determines that there is no longer potential for criminal prosecution, Defendant expressly reserves the right to withdraw his assertion of the privilege, to seek leave to amend and/or supplement this response accordingly (in whole or in part), and to object to the use or disclosure of the this response for any purpose whatsoever.
- 40. In response to paragraph 40 of the SAC, Defendant hereby asserts the privilege against self-incrimination under the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution; the Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 501; the California Constitution, Article 1, Section 15; and California Evidence Code section 940. To the extent Defendant determines that there is no longer potential for criminal prosecution, Defendant expressly reserves the right to withdraw his assertion of the privilege, to seek leave to amend and/or supplement this response accordingly (in whole or in part), and to object to the use or disclosure of the this response for any purpose whatsoever.
- 41. In response to paragraph 41 of the SAC, Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in said paragraph, and on that

basis denies each and every allegation contained therein.

basis denies each and every allegation contained therein.

.o I me response us

42. In response to paragraph 42 of the SAC, Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in said paragraph, and on that

- 43. In response to paragraph 43 of the SAC, Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations relating to KFC, and on that basis denies each such allegation contained therein. As to the remaining allegations contained therein, Defendant hereby asserts the privilege against self-incrimination under the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution; the Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 501; the California Constitution, Article 1, Section 15; and California Evidence Code section 940. To the extent Defendant determines that there is no longer potential for criminal prosecution, Defendant expressly reserves the right to withdraw his assertion of the privilege, to seek leave to amend and/or supplement this response accordingly (in whole or in part), and to object to the use or disclosure of the this response for any purpose whatsoever.
- 44. In response to paragraph 44 of the SAC, Defendant responds to Plaintiff's prayer for relief as set forth below.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION (18 U.S.C. §1962(c))

- 45. In response to paragraph 45 of the SAC, Defendant refers to and incorporates herein Defendant's responses as provided in paragraphs 1 through 44 above.
- 46. In response to paragraph 46 of the SAC, Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations relating to defendants Brian Dunning and Todd Dunning, and on that basis denies each such allegation contained therein. As to the remaining allegations contained therein, Defendant hereby asserts the privilege against self-incrimination under the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution; the Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 501; the California Constitution, Article 1, Section 15; and California Evidence Code section 940. To the extent Defendant determines that there is no longer potential for criminal prosecution, Defendant expressly reserves the right to withdraw his assertion of the privilege, to seek leave to amend and/or supplement this response accordingly (in whole or in part), and to object to the use or disclosure of the this response

for any purpose whatsoever.

- 47. In response to paragraph 47 of the SAC, Defendant admits that Defendant DIGITAL POINT SOLUTIONS, INC. was incorporated as a California corporation on May 14, 2007. As to the remaining allegations contained therein, Defendant hereby asserts the privilege against self-incrimination under the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution; the Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 501; the California Constitution, Article 1, Section 15; and California Evidence Code section 940. To the extent Defendant determines that there is no longer potential for criminal prosecution, Defendant expressly reserves the right to withdraw his assertion of the privilege, to seek leave to amend and/or supplement this response accordingly (in whole or in part), and to object to the use or disclosure of the this response for any purpose whatsoever.
- 48. In response to paragraph 48 of the SAC, Defendant hereby asserts the privilege against self-incrimination under the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution; the Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 501; the California Constitution, Article 1, Section 15; and California Evidence Code section 940. To the extent Defendant determines that there is no longer potential for criminal prosecution, Defendant expressly reserves the right to withdraw his assertion of the privilege, to seek leave to amend and/or supplement this response accordingly (in whole or in part), and to object to the use or disclosure of the this response for any purpose whatsoever.
- 49. In response to paragraph 49 of the SAC, Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in said paragraph, and on that basis denies each and every allegation contained therein.
- 50. In response to paragraph 50 of the SAC, Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations relating to KFC and/or the alleged Dunning Group, and on that basis denies each such allegation contained therein. As to the remaining allegations contained therein, Defendant hereby asserts the privilege against self-incrimination under the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution; the Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 501; the California Constitution, Article 1, Section 15; and California Evidence Code section 940. To the extent Defendant determines that there is no longer potential for criminal prosecution, Defendant expressly reserves the right to withdraw his assertion of the privilege, to seek leave to amend and/or supplement this response

accordingly (in whole or in part), and to object to the use or disclosure of the this response for any purpose whatsoever.

- 51. In response to paragraph 51 of the SAC, Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations relating to KFC and/or the alleged Dunning Group, and on that basis denies each such allegation contained therein. As to the remaining allegations contained therein, Defendant hereby asserts the privilege against self-incrimination under the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution; the Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 501; the California Constitution, Article 1, Section 15; and California Evidence Code section 940. To the extent Defendant determines that there is no longer potential for criminal prosecution, Defendant expressly reserves the right to withdraw his assertion of the privilege, to seek leave to amend and/or supplement this response accordingly (in whole or in part), and to object to the use or disclosure of the this response for any purpose whatsoever.
- 52. In response to paragraph 52 of the SAC, Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations relating to any investigation conducted by Plaintiff, and on that basis denies each such allegation contained therein. As to the remaining allegations contained therein, Defendant hereby asserts the privilege against self-incrimination under the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution; the Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 501; the California Constitution, Article 1, Section 15; and California Evidence Code section 940. To the extent Defendant determines that there is no longer potential for criminal prosecution, Defendant expressly reserves the right to withdraw his assertion of the privilege, to seek leave to amend and/or supplement this response accordingly (in whole or in part), and to object to the use or disclosure of the this response for any purpose whatsoever.
- 53. In response to paragraph 53 of the SAC, Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations relating to any tests conducted by Plaintiff, and on that basis denies each such allegation contained therein. Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations relating to KFC and/or the alleged Dunning Group, and on that basis denies each such allegation contained therein. As to the remaining allegations contained therein, Defendant hereby asserts the privilege against self-incrimination

under the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution; the Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 501; the California Constitution, Article 1, Section 15; and California Evidence Code section 940. To the extent Defendant determines that there is no longer potential for criminal prosecution, Defendant expressly reserves the right to withdraw his assertion of the privilege, to seek leave to amend and/or supplement this response accordingly (in whole or in part), and to object to the use or disclosure of the this response for any purpose whatsoever.

- 54. In response to paragraph 54 of the SAC, Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations relating to investigations conducted or actions undertaken by Gallivan, Gallivan & O'Melia LLC, and on that basis denies each such allegation contained therein. As to the remaining allegations contained therein, Defendant hereby asserts the privilege against self-incrimination under the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution; the Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 501; the California Constitution, Article 1, Section 15; and California Evidence Code section 940. To the extent Defendant determines that there is no longer potential for criminal prosecution, Defendant expressly reserves the right to withdraw his assertion of the privilege, to seek leave to amend and/or supplement this response accordingly (in whole or in part), and to object to the use or disclosure of the this response for any purpose whatsoever.
- 55. In response to paragraph 55 of the SAC, Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations relating to investigations conducted or actions undertaken by Gallivan, Gallivan & O'Melia LLC, and on that basis denies each such allegation contained therein. As to the remaining allegations contained therein, Defendant hereby asserts the privilege against self-incrimination under the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution; the Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 501; the California Constitution, Article 1, Section 15; and California Evidence Code section 940. To the extent Defendant determines that there is no longer potential for criminal prosecution, Defendant expressly reserves the right to withdraw his assertion of the privilege, to seek leave to amend and/or supplement this response accordingly (in whole or in part), and to object to the use or disclosure of the this response for any purpose whatsoever.
- 56. In response to paragraph 56 of the SAC, Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations relating to investigations conducted or

actions undertaken by Plaintiff, and on that basis denies each such allegation contained therein. Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations relating to KFC and/or the alleged Dunning Group, and on that basis denies each such allegation contained therein. As to the remaining allegations contained therein, Defendant hereby asserts the privilege against self-incrimination under the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution; the Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 501; the California Constitution, Article 1, Section 15; and California Evidence Code section 940. To the extent Defendant determines that there is no longer potential for criminal prosecution, Defendant expressly reserves the right to withdraw his assertion of the privilege, to seek leave to amend and/or supplement this response accordingly (in whole or in part), and to object to the use or disclosure of the this response for any purpose whatsoever.

- 57. In response to paragraph 57 of the SAC, Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations relating to actions undertaken by Plaintiff, and on that basis denies each such allegation contained therein. Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations relating to KFC and/or the alleged Dunning Group, and on that basis denies each such allegation contained therein. As to the remaining allegations contained therein, Defendant hereby asserts the privilege against self-incrimination under the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution; the Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 501; the California Constitution, Article 1, Section 15; and California Evidence Code section 940. To the extent Defendant determines that there is no longer potential for criminal prosecution, Defendant expressly reserves the right to withdraw his assertion of the privilege, to seek leave to amend and/or supplement this response accordingly (in whole or in part), and to object to the use or disclosure of the this response for any purpose whatsoever.
- 58. In response to paragraph 58 of the SAC, Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations relating to actions undertaken by Plaintiff, and on that basis denies each such allegation contained therein. Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations relating to KFC and/or Todd Dunning, and on that basis denies each such allegation contained therein. As to the remaining allegations contained therein, Defendant hereby asserts the privilege against self-incrimination under the

Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution; the Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 501; the California Constitution, Article 1, Section 15; and California Evidence Code section 940. To the extent Defendant determines that there is no longer potential for criminal prosecution, Defendant expressly reserves the right to withdraw his assertion of the privilege, to seek leave to amend and/or supplement this response accordingly (in whole or in part), and to object to the use or disclosure of the this response for any purpose whatsoever.

- 59. In response to paragraph 59 of the SAC, Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations relating to KFC and/or the alleged Dunning Group, and on that basis denies each such allegation contained therein. As to the remaining allegations contained therein, Defendant hereby asserts the privilege against self-incrimination under the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution; the Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 501; the California Constitution, Article 1, Section 15; and California Evidence Code section 940. To the extent Defendant determines that there is no longer potential for criminal prosecution, Defendant expressly reserves the right to withdraw his assertion of the privilege, to seek leave to amend and/or supplement this response accordingly (in whole or in part), and to object to the use or disclosure of the this response for any purpose whatsoever.
- 60. In response to paragraph 60 of the SAC, Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations relating to KFC, Todd Dunning, Brian Dunning, and/or the alleged Dunning Group, and on that basis denies each such allegation contained therein. As to the remaining allegations contained therein, Defendant hereby asserts the privilege against self-incrimination under the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution; the Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 501; the California Constitution, Article 1, Section 15; and California Evidence Code section 940. To the extent Defendant determines that there is no longer potential for criminal prosecution, Defendant expressly reserves the right to withdraw his assertion of the privilege, to seek leave to amend and/or supplement this response accordingly (in whole or in part), and to object to the use or disclosure of the this response for any purpose whatsoever.
- 61. In response to paragraph 61 of the SAC, Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations relating to KFC, and on that basis denies

/././

each such allegation contained therein. As to the remaining allegations contained therein, Defendant hereby asserts the privilege against self-incrimination under the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution; the Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 501; the California Constitution, Article 1, Section 15; and California Evidence Code section 940. To the extent Defendant determines that there is no longer potential for criminal prosecution, Defendant expressly reserves the right to withdraw his assertion of the privilege, to seek leave to amend and/or supplement this response accordingly (in whole or in part), and to object to the use or disclosure of the this response for any purpose whatsoever.

- 62. In response to paragraph 62 of the SAC, Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations relating to the alleged Dunning Group, and on that basis denies each such allegation contained therein. As to the remaining allegations contained therein, Defendant hereby asserts the privilege against self-incrimination under the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution; the Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 501; the California Constitution, Article 1, Section 15; and California Evidence Code section 940. To the extent Defendant determines that there is no longer potential for criminal prosecution, Defendant expressly reserves the right to withdraw his assertion of the privilege, to seek leave to amend and/or supplement this response accordingly (in whole or in part), and to object to the use or disclosure of the this response for any purpose whatsoever.
- 63. In response to paragraph 63 of the SAC, Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations relating to the alleged Dunning Group, and on that basis denies each such allegation contained therein. As to the remaining allegations contained therein, Defendant hereby asserts the privilege against self-incrimination under the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution; the Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 501; the California Constitution, Article 1, Section 15; and California Evidence Code section 940. To the extent Defendant determines that there is no longer potential for criminal prosecution, Defendant expressly reserves the right to withdraw his assertion of the privilege, to seek leave to amend and/or supplement this response accordingly (in whole or in part), and to object to the use or disclosure of the this response for any purpose whatsoever.

64.

relief as set forth below.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION (Fraud)

In response to paragraph 64 of the SAC, Defendant responds to Plaintiff's prayer for

- 65. In response to paragraph 65 of the SAC, Defendant refers to and incorporates herein Defendant's responses as provided in paragraphs 1 through 64 above.
- 66. In response to paragraph 66 of the SAC, Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations relating to the alleged DOE defendants, and on that basis denies each such allegation contained therein. As to the remaining allegations, Defendant hereby asserts the privilege against self-incrimination under the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution; the Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 501; the California Constitution, Article 1, Section 15; and California Evidence Code section 940. To the extent Defendant determines that there is no longer potential for criminal prosecution, Defendant expressly reserves the right to withdraw his assertion of the privilege, to seek leave to amend and/or supplement this response accordingly (in whole or in part), and to object to the use or disclosure of the this response for any purpose whatsoever.
- 67. In response to paragraph 67 of the SAC, Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in said paragraph, and on that basis denies each and every allegation contained therein.
- 68. In response to paragraph 68 of the SAC, Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations relating to KFC and/or the alleged DOE defendants, and on that basis denies each such allegation contained therein. As to the remaining allegations contained therein, Defendant hereby asserts the privilege against self-incrimination under the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution; the Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 501; the California Constitution, Article 1, Section 15; and California Evidence Code section 940. To the extent Defendant determines that there is no longer potential for criminal prosecution, Defendant expressly reserves the right to withdraw his assertion of the privilege, to seek leave to amend and/or supplement this response accordingly (in whole or in part), and to object to the use or disclosure of the this response for any purpose whatsoever.

69.

A CD C 1 (Cl H

information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations relating to KFC and/or the alleged DOE defendants, and on that basis denies each such allegation contained therein. As to the remaining allegations contained therein, Defendant hereby asserts the privilege against self-incrimination under the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution; the Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 501; the California Constitution, Article 1, Section 15; and California Evidence Code section 940. To the extent Defendant determines that there is no longer potential for criminal prosecution, Defendant expressly reserves the right to withdraw his assertion of the privilege, to seek leave to amend and/or supplement this response accordingly (in whole or in part), and to object to the use or disclosure of the this response for any purpose whatsoever.

In response to paragraph 69 of the SAC, Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or

- 70. In response to paragraph 70 of the SAC, Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations relating to KFC and/or the alleged DOE defendants, and on that basis denies each such allegation contained therein. As to the remaining allegations contained therein, Defendant hereby asserts the privilege against self-incrimination under the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution; the Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 501; the California Constitution, Article 1, Section 15; and California Evidence Code section 940. To the extent Defendant determines that there is no longer potential for criminal prosecution, Defendant expressly reserves the right to withdraw his assertion of the privilege, to seek leave to amend and/or supplement this response accordingly (in whole or in part), and to object to the use or disclosure of the this response for any purpose whatsoever.
- 71. In response to paragraph 71 of the SAC, Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations relating to KFC and/or the alleged DOE defendants, and on that basis denies each such allegation contained therein. As to the remaining allegations contained therein, Defendant hereby asserts the privilege against self-incrimination under the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution; the Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 501; the California Constitution, Article 1, Section 15; and California Evidence Code section 940. To the extent Defendant determines that there is no longer potential for criminal prosecution, Defendant expressly reserves the right to withdraw his assertion of the privilege, to seek leave to amend and/or supplement

this response accordingly (in whole or in part), and to object to the use or disclosure of the this response for any purpose whatsoever.

- 72. In response to paragraph 72 of the SAC, Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations relating to KFC and/or the alleged DOE defendants, and on that basis denies each such allegation contained therein. As to the remaining allegations contained therein, Defendant hereby asserts the privilege against self-incrimination under the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution; the Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 501; the California Constitution, Article 1, Section 15; and California Evidence Code section 940. To the extent Defendant determines that there is no longer potential for criminal prosecution, Defendant expressly reserves the right to withdraw his assertion of the privilege, to seek leave to amend and/or supplement this response accordingly (in whole or in part), and to object to the use or disclosure of the this response for any purpose whatsoever.
- 73. In response to paragraph 73 of the SAC, Defendant hereby asserts the privilege against self-incrimination under the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution; the Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 501; the California Constitution, Article 1, Section 15; and California Evidence Code section 940. To the extent Defendant determines that there is no longer potential for criminal prosecution, Defendant expressly reserves the right to withdraw his assertion of the privilege, to seek leave to amend and/or supplement this response accordingly (in whole or in part), and to object to the use or disclosure of the this response for any purpose whatsoever.
- 74. In response to paragraph 74 of the SAC, Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations relating to KFC and/or the alleged DOE defendants, and on that basis denies each such allegation contained therein. As to the remaining allegations contained therein, Defendant hereby asserts the privilege against self-incrimination under the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution; the Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 501; the California Constitution, Article 1, Section 15; and California Evidence Code section 940. To the extent Defendant determines that there is no longer potential for criminal prosecution, Defendant expressly reserves the right to withdraw his assertion of the privilege, to seek leave to amend and/or supplement this response accordingly (in whole or in part), and to object to the use or disclosure of the this response

for any purpose whatsoever.

75. In response to paragraph 75 of the SAC, Defendant responds to Plaintiff's prayer for relief as set forth below.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION (California Penal Code §502)

- 76. In response to paragraph 76 of the SAC, Defendant refers to and incorporates herein Defendant's responses as provided in paragraphs 1 through 75 above.
- 77. In response to paragraph 77 of the SAC, Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations relating to KFC, and on that basis denies each such allegation contained therein. As to the remaining allegations contained therein, Defendant hereby asserts the privilege against self-incrimination under the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution; the Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 501; the California Constitution, Article 1, Section 15; and California Evidence Code section 940. To the extent Defendant determines that there is no longer potential for criminal prosecution, Defendant expressly reserves the right to withdraw his assertion of the privilege, to seek leave to amend and/or supplement this response accordingly (in whole or in part), and to object to the use or disclosure of the this response for any purpose whatsoever.
- 78. In response to paragraph 78 of the SAC, Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations relating to KFC, and on that basis denies each such allegation contained therein. As to the remaining allegations contained therein, Defendant hereby asserts the privilege against self-incrimination under the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution; the Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 501; the California Constitution, Article 1, Section 15; and California Evidence Code section 940. To the extent Defendant determines that there is no longer potential for criminal prosecution, Defendant expressly reserves the right to withdraw his assertion of the privilege, to seek leave to amend and/or supplement this response accordingly (in whole or in part), and to object to the use or disclosure of the this response for any purpose whatsoever.
- 79. In response to paragraph 79 of the SAC, Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations relating to KFC, and on that basis denies each such allegation contained therein. As to the remaining allegations contained therein, Defendant

hereby asserts the privilege against self-incrimination under the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution; the Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 501; the California Constitution, Article 1, Section 15; and California Evidence Code section 940. To the extent Defendant determines that there is no longer potential for criminal prosecution, Defendant expressly reserves the right to withdraw his assertion of the privilege, to seek leave to amend and/or supplement this response accordingly (in whole or in part), and to object to the use or disclosure of the this response for any purpose whatsoever.

- 80. In response to paragraph 80 of the SAC, Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations relating to KFC, and on that basis denies each such allegation contained therein. As to the remaining allegations contained therein, Defendant hereby asserts the privilege against self-incrimination under the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution; the Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 501; the California Constitution, Article 1, Section 15; and California Evidence Code section 940. To the extent Defendant determines that there is no longer potential for criminal prosecution, Defendant expressly reserves the right to withdraw his assertion of the privilege, to seek leave to amend and/or supplement this response accordingly (in whole or in part), and to object to the use or disclosure of the this response for any purpose whatsoever.
- 81. In response to paragraph 81 of the SAC, Defendant responds to Plaintiff's prayer for relief as set forth below.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION (Restitution and Unjust Enrichment)

- 82. In response to paragraph 82 of the SAC, Defendant refers to and incorporates herein Defendant's responses as provided in paragraphs 1 through 81 above.
- 83. In response to paragraph 83 of the SAC, Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations relating to KFC, and on that basis denies each such allegation contained therein. As to the remaining allegations contained therein, Defendant hereby asserts the privilege against self-incrimination under the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution; the Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 501; the California Constitution, Article 1, Section 15; and California Evidence Code section 940. To the extent Defendant determines that there is no longer potential for criminal prosecution, Defendant expressly reserves the right to withdraw his assertion of the

privilege, to seek leave to amend and/or supplement this response accordingly (in whole or in part), and to object to the use or disclosure of the this response for any purpose whatsoever.

- 84. In response to paragraph 84 of the SAC, Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations relating to KFC, and on that basis denies each such allegation contained therein. As to the remaining allegations contained therein, Defendant hereby asserts the privilege against self-incrimination under the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution; the Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 501; the California Constitution, Article 1, Section 15; and California Evidence Code section 940. To the extent Defendant determines that there is no longer potential for criminal prosecution, Defendant expressly reserves the right to withdraw his assertion of the privilege, to seek leave to amend and/or supplement this response accordingly (in whole or in part), and to object to the use or disclosure of the this response for any purpose whatsoever.
- 85. In response to paragraph 85 of the SAC, Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations relating to KFC, and on that basis denies each such allegation contained therein. As to the remaining allegations contained therein, Defendant hereby asserts the privilege against self-incrimination under the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution; the Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 501; the California Constitution, Article 1, Section 15; and California Evidence Code section 940. To the extent Defendant determines that there is no longer potential for criminal prosecution, Defendant expressly reserves the right to withdraw his assertion of the privilege, to seek leave to amend and/or supplement this response accordingly (in whole or in part), and to object to the use or disclosure of the this response for any purpose whatsoever.
- 86. In response to paragraph 86 of the SAC, Defendant responds to Plaintiff's prayer for relief as set forth below.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(California Business & Professions Code §17200)

- 87. In response to paragraph 87 of the SAC, Defendant refers to and incorporates herein Defendant's responses as provided in paragraphs 1 through 86 above.
- 88. In response to paragraph 88 of the SAC, Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations relating to KFC, and on that basis denies

each such allegation contained therein. As to the remaining allegations contained therein, Defendant hereby asserts the privilege against self-incrimination under the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution; the Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 501; the California Constitution, Article 1, Section 15; and California Evidence Code section 940. To the extent Defendant determines that there is no longer potential for criminal prosecution, Defendant expressly reserves the right to withdraw his assertion of the privilege, to seek leave to amend and/or supplement this response accordingly (in whole or in part), and to object to the use or disclosure of the this response for any purpose whatsoever.

- 89. In response to paragraph 89 of the SAC, Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations relating to KFC, and on that basis denies each such allegation contained therein. As to the remaining allegations contained therein, Defendant hereby asserts the privilege against self-incrimination under the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution; the Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 501; the California Constitution, Article 1, Section 15; and California Evidence Code section 940. To the extent Defendant determines that there is no longer potential for criminal prosecution, Defendant expressly reserves the right to withdraw his assertion of the privilege, to seek leave to amend and/or supplement this response accordingly (in whole or in part), and to object to the use or disclosure of the this response for any purpose whatsoever.
- 90. In response to paragraph 90 of the SAC, Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations relating to KFC, and on that basis denies each such allegation contained therein. As to the remaining allegations contained therein, Defendant hereby asserts the privilege against self-incrimination under the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution; the Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 501; the California Constitution, Article 1, Section 15; and California Evidence Code section 940. To the extent Defendant determines that there is no longer potential for criminal prosecution, Defendant expressly reserves the right to withdraw his assertion of the privilege, to seek leave to amend and/or supplement this response accordingly (in whole or in part), and to object to the use or disclosure of the this response for any purpose whatsoever.
- 91. In response to paragraph 91 of the SAC, Defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations relating to KFC, and on that basis denies each such allegation contained therein. As to the remaining allegations contained therein, Defendant

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

92. In response to paragraph 92 of the SAC, Defendant responds to Plaintiff's prayer for relief as set forth below.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

Defendant alleges the following affirmative defenses:

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Failure to State a Claim)

93. As a first, separate and distinct affirmative defense, and solely by way of an alternative defense, not to be construed as an admission or waiver of any kind, Defendants allege that Plaintiff's SAC, and every purported cause of action stated therein, fails to state facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action against Defendant.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE:

(Contractual Limitations Period)

94. As a second and separate Affirmative Defense, and solely by way of an alternative defense, not to be construed as an admission or waiver of any kind, Defendant alleges that the SAC and each and every cause of action therein is barred by the one-year contractual limitations provision set forth in the Commission Junction Publisher Services Agreement of which Plaintiff is a third party beneficiary and which Plaintiff incorporated by reference into the eBay Supplemental Terms & Conditions.

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE:

(Statute of Limitations)

95. As a third and separate Affirmative Defense, and solely by way of an alternative defense, not to be construed as an admission or waiver of any kind, Defendant alleges that the SAC and each and every cause of action therein is barred by the applicable statute of limitations. Said limitations include,

1	but are not limited to, 18 U.S.C. §1030(g), 15 U.S.C. §15b (as applied to 18 U.S.C. §§1962, 1964),		
2	California Penal Code §502(e)(5), California Code of Civil Procedure §§ 338, 339, and California		
3	Business & Professions Code §17208.		
4 5	FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE: (Improper Venue)		
6	96. As a fourth and separate Affirmative Defense, and solely by way of an alternative		
7	defense, not to be construed as an admission or waiver of any kind, Defendant alleges that the filing of		
8	this action in the above-captioned Court is improper based on the forum selection clause set forth in the		
9	Commission Junction Publisher Services Agreement of which Plaintiff is a third party beneficiary and		
10	which Plaintiff incorporated by reference into the eBay Supplemental Terms & Conditions.		
11	<u>FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE</u> : (Consent)		
12	97. As a fifth and separate Affirmative Defense, and solely by way of an alternative defense,		
13	not to be construed as an admission or waiver of any kind, Defendant alleges that the SAC and each and		
14 15	every cause of action therein is barred because any such conduct as alleged in the SAC was consented to		
16	by Plaintiff		
17	SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE: (Authorization)		
18	98. As a sixth and separate Affirmative Defense, and solely by way of an alternative defense,		
19	not to be construed as an admission or waiver of any kind, Defendant alleges that the SAC and each and		
20	every cause of action therein is barred because any such conduct as alleged in the SAC was known,		
21	authorized, and encouraged by Plaintiff.		
22 23	<u>SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE</u> : (Estoppel)		
24	99. As a seventh and separate Affirmative Defense, and solely by way of an alternative		
25	defense, not to be construed as an admission or waiver of any kind, Defendant alleges that the SAC and		
26	each and every cause of action therein is barred because Plaintiff's acts, omissions, representations and		
27	conduct constitute an estoppel, and bar its claims.		
28			

1 2 3 4 5 made against Defendant. 6 7 8 101. 9 10 11 12 13 14 102. 15 16 17 18 19 103. 20 21 22 reasonable calculation. 23 24 25 104. 26 27

EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE:

(Waiver)

100. As an eighth and separate Affirmative Defense, and solely by way of an alternative defense, not to be construed as an admission of waiver of any kind, Defendant alleges that the SAC and each and every cause of action therein is barred because Plaintiff has waived any and all claims it has made against Defendant.

NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE:

(Laches, Unclean Hands, Acquiescence, Ratification, Assumption of the Risk)

101. As a ninth and separate Affirmative Defense, and solely by way of an alternative defense, not to be construed as an admission or waiver of any kind, Defendant alleges that the SAC and each and every cause of action therein is barred by the doctrine of laches, unclean hands, acquiescence, ratification, and reasonably implied assumption of the risk.

TENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE:

(No Damages Suffered)

102. As a tenth and separate Affirmative Defense, and solely by way of an alternative defense, not to be construed as an admission or waiver of any kind, Defendant alleges that the SAC and each and every cause of action therein is barred because Plaintiff never sustained any damages caused by Defendant, and Plaintiff lacks standing.

ELEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE:

(Damages Not Subject to Reasonable Calculation)

103. As an eleventh and separate Affirmative Defense, and solely by way of an alternative defense, not to be construed as an admission or waiver of any kind, Defendant alleges that the SAC and each and every cause of action therein is barred because Plaintiff's damages, if any, are not subject to reasonable calculation.

TWELFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE:

(Failure to Mitigate Damages)

104. As a twelfth and separate Affirmative Defense, and solely by way of an alternative defense, not to be construed as an admission or waiver of any kind, Defendant alleges that the SAC and each and every cause of action therein is barred because Plaintiff failed to exercise reasonable

28

28

resourcefulness, care and diligence to mitigate any damages, and any recovery against Defendant should be reduced accordingly.

THIRTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE:

(In Pari Delicto)

105. As a thirteenth and separate Affirmative Defense, and solely by way of an alternative defense, not to be construed as an admission or waiver of any kind, Defendant alleges that the SAC and each and every cause of action therein is barred by the doctrine of in pari delicto.

FOURTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE:

(Plaintiff's Negligence)

106. As a fourteenth and separate Affirmative Defense, and solely by way of an alternative defense, not to be construed as an admission or waiver of any kind, Defendant alleges that the SAC and each and every cause of action therein is barred because Plaintiff's damages, if any, were caused by Plaintiff's own negligence or want of ordinary care and prudence.

FIFTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE:

(Intervening/Superseding Actions)

107. As a fifteenth and separate Affirmative Defense, and solely by way of an alternative defense, not to be construed as an admission or waiver of any kind, Defendant alleges that the SAC and each and every cause of action therein is barred to the extent that the damages or losses allegedly sustained by Plaintiff, if any, were the direct and proximate result of intervening and superceding actions on the part of other parties, and not Defendant, barring Plaintiff's recovery from Defendant.

SIXTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE:

(No Intent to Injure)

108. As a sixteenth and separate Affirmative Defense, and solely by way of an alternative defense, not to be construed as an admission or waiver of any kind, Defendant alleges that the SAC and each and every cause of action therein is barred because Defendant at no time acted with any intent to injure Plaintiff, and the Defendant took no actions intended to cause any harm to Plaintiff.

SEVENTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE:

(No Willful, Malicious, Oppressive or Outrageous Conduct)

109. As a seventeenth and separate Affirmative Defense, and solely by way of an alternative

1	d
2	n
3	
4	
5	
6	d
7	p
8	
9	
10	
11	d
12	o
13	p
14	n
15	
16	
17	
18	d
19	e
20	
21	
22	.1
23	d
24	d
25	
26	
27	

defense, not to be construed as an admission or waiver of any kind, Defendant alleges that Defendant did not engage in any willful, malicious, oppressive or outrageous conduct with regard to Plaintiff.

EIGHTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE:

(Adequate Legal Remedy)

110. As an eighteenth and separate Affirmative Defense, and solely by way of an alternative defense, not to be construed as an admission of waiver of any kind, Defendant alleges that Plaintiff's prayer for injunctive relief is barred because Plaintiff has an adequate remedy at law.

NINETEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE:

(Any Harm Proximately Caused by Others)

111. As a nineteenth and separate Affirmative Defense, and solely by way of an alternative defense, not to be construed as an admission, Defendant alleges that the SAC and each and every cause of action therein is barred because any losses, damages and/or injuries sustained by Plaintiff were proximately caused by the fault of persons or entities other than Defendant, over whom Defendant has no control.

TWENTIETH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE:

(Good Faith)

112. As a twentieth and separate Affirmative Defense, and solely by way of an alternative defense, not to be construed as an admission of waiver of any kind, Defendant alleges that the SAC and each and every cause of action therein is barred because Defendant has acted in good faith.

TWENTY-FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE:

(Setoff)

113. As a twenty-first and separate Affirmative Defense, and solely by way of an alternative defense, not to be construed as an admission of waiver of any kind, Defendant alleges that Plaintiff's damages, if any, are subject to setoff and should be reduced accordingly.

TWENTY-SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE:

(Indispensable Party)

114. As a twenty-second and separate Affirmative Defense, and solely by way of an alternative defense, not to be construed as an admission of waiver of any kind, Defendant alleges that the SAC and each and every cause of action therein is barred because Plaintiff has failed to join an indispensable party

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	1

or parties to this action.

TWENTY-THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE:

(Plaintiff's Agents)

115. As a twenty-third and separate Affirmative Defense, and solely by way of an alternative defense, not to be construed as an admission of waiver of any kind, Defendant alleges that the SAC and each and every cause of action therein is barred based on the actions and/or omissions of Plaintiff's own agents.

TWENTY-FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE:

(Reservation of Right to Assert Additional Defenses)

alternative defense, not to be construed as an admission, Defendant alleges that at the time of the filing of this Answer, affirmative defenses may not have been alleged for reasons that insufficient facts and information were available after reasonable inquiry. Defendant therefore reserves the right to amend this answer to allege additional affirmative defenses based upon subsequent discovery of new or different facts or subsequent appreciation of currently known facts.

RESPONSE TO PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Defendant SHAWN HOGAN prays for judgment as follows:

- 1. That Plaintiff take nothing by reason of its SAC and that judgment be entered in favor of Defendant:
- 2. That Defendant be awarded costs of suit incurred in the defense of this action including reasonable attorneys' fees, to the extent allowed by law;
- 3. For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper. Respectfully submitted,

DATED: August 31, 2009

s/Ross M. Campbell
COAST LAW GROUP, LLP
Attorneys for Defendants Shawn Hogan
and Digital Point Solutions, Inc.